

**Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board
Chairs Meeting
September 6-8, 2006, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Meeting Minutes**

The Environmental Management (EM) Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) met September 6-8, 2006 at the La Fonda Hotel in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Northern New Mexico Citizen's Advisory Board hosted the meeting. Meeting participants included Chairs, Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs, other SSAB members, Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters and field staff, site coordinators, SSAB administrators and support staff. The meeting was facilitated by Mike Schoener, facilitator for the Savannah River Citizens Advisory Board. Many of the meeting attendees participated in a tour of the Bradbury Museum in Los Alamos, New Mexico and Los Alamos National Laboratory's (LANL) Area G Facility and other LANL sites on September 6, 2006.

Participants

Hanford Advisory Board	
Shelley Cimon	Member
Idaho National Laboratory Citizens' Advisory Board	
Richard L. Buxton	Co-Chairman
William S. Flanery	Co-Chairman
Willie Preacher	Member
Nevada Test Site Citizens' Advisory Board	
Robert L. Gatliff	Member
Dona Merritt	Support Staff
Kathleen Peterson	Chair
Carla Sanda	Support Staff
Kelly Snyder	Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO)
Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board	
Fran Berting	Member
J.D. Campbell	Chair
Richard Cunningham	Nominee
Richard Deertrack	Member
Gaeton Falance	DDFO
Donald Jordan	Member
Barbara Gonzales	Member
Pamela Henline	Member
Christina Houston	DDFO
Mary Pat Kraemer	Member
Lorelei Novak	Technical Programs
Grace Roybal	Adm. Assistant
Menice Santistevan	Executive Director
Darlene Strosnider	Member
Christopher M. Timm	Member
Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board	
Ben S. Adams	Member
David Adler	DOE Liaison
Steve Dixon	Member

Richard Ketelle	Technical Lead, Water Resources Restoration Program, Bechtel Jacobs Co.
Norman Mulvenon	Vice Chair
Pete Osborne	Support Staff
Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board	
Allen Burnett	Member
David Dollins	Federal Coordinator
Linda Long	Member
Rhonda Smith	Chair
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board	
Donna Antonucci	Vice Chair
Gerri Flemming	Federal Coordinator
Dawn Haygood	Administrator
Karen Patterson	Chair
Mike Schoener	Facilitator
DOE Headquarters	
James A. Rispoli	Assistant Secretary for EM
Melissa Nielson	Office Public & Intergovernmental Accountability
Doug Frost	Designated Federal Officer
Christine Gelles	Office of Disposal Operations
Larry Bailey	Office of Groundwater & Soil Remediation
National Nuclear Security Administration	
Alice Williams	Office of Environmental Projects and Operations
DOE Los Alamos Site Office	
Bernard Pleau	Office of Public Affairs
George Rael	Assistant Manager for Environmental Programs
Ed Wilmot	Site Office Manager
Los Alamos National Laboratory	
Tina Behr-Andres	Program Director
Lorrie Bonds-Lopez	Public Involvement
John Mitchell	Deputy Director
Andy Phelps	Associate Director for EM Program
New Mexico Environment Department	
Cindy Padilla	
Others Present	
James R. Brannon	Private Citizen
Norm Cimon	Private Citizen
Rich Cunningham	Private Citizen
Linda Deertrack	Private Citizen
Rob Dunham	Private Citizen
Beverly Flowers	Private Citizen
Evelyn Milby	Private Citizen

Thursday, September 7, 2006

Welcome and Overview

The Fall 2006 semi-annual United States (U.S.) Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Management (EM) Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs meeting was held September 6-8, 2006 at La Fonda Hotel in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) hosted the meeting. Designated Federal Officer Doug Frost, DOE/Headquarters (HQ) presided. Representatives from the following SSABs attended:

- Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)
- Idaho National Laboratory Site Citizens Advisory Board (INL CAB)
- Nevada Test Site Community Advisory Board (NTS CAB)
- Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB)
- Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB)
- Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board (PGDP CAB)
- Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB)

Representatives from the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) attended. (See Participants List above for individuals in attendance.)

Mr. J.D. Campbell, NNMCAB Chair, provided welcome comments to the group and thanked the organizers and the groups who sponsored the reception and the breaks.

Mayor David Coss addressed the group on behalf of the City of Santa Fe. He provided the guests some historical background information on Santa Fe and referenced the city's interest in LANL. He discussed the shared water interests of the state with the Lab. He invited the guests to participate in Fiesta weekend, one of the oldest festivals in the United States.

Mr. Douglas Frost, DOE Designated Federal Officer, also welcomed the group and formally called the September 2006 EM SSAB Semi-annual Chairs meeting to order. He discussed the historical significance of the Los Alamos site; commonly referred to as the "birthplace of the atomic bomb."

Mr. Mike Schoener, meeting facilitator, reviewed the agenda and ground rules for the meeting.

Update on Waste Disposition, Ms. Christine Gelles, Director, Office of Disposal Operations

Ms. Gelles provided a report to the group entitled, "Update on Waste Disposition." The presentation was an update on waste disposition strategies for the DOE. She provided also the following website for information on waste disposition maps: <http://wims.arc.fiu.edu/wims/>. Mr. Doug Tonkay, (301) 903-7212, was announced as a contact name for more information.

Integrated Disposition Systems continue to be the primary focus of work. Ms. Gelles provided a matrix organization chart that shows the collaboration of all other EM offices. The chart also reflects the consolidation of important facets of disposition planning (regulatory compliance drivers, policies, public involvement, etc.). Ms. Gelles discussed the EM budget rollout for Fiscal Year 2007 (FY07). Three quarters of the budget is wrapped up in disposition activities. What is important to note is that all work has been projectized (work defined and budgeted). Ms. Gelles discussed the Five Year Plan and noted

that budgets are declining. Out year budgets are challenged in the areas of tank waste management and construction of large facilities that will vitrify and stabilize materials. Significant costs are tied up in special nuclear material storage facilities (Category 1 and 2 storage facilities) in light of new design basis threat configurations. Costs are increasing in these areas. It is important that we find ways to optimize waste disposition.

What's New In Major Waste Streams at Sites – Disposal Highlights

DOE is rethinking how it uses the Nevada Test Site (NTS) disposal facility in light of reduced volumes of wastes going to NTS and budget pressures. The costs of operating NTS are the same regardless of the amount of waste disposed at the facility resulting in inefficient operating of the facility. Funding of operations needs to be changed. While for FY07, a waste generator set aside fee system will continue to be used, EM will use a more direct funding approach for disposal operations in Fiscal Year 2008. Additionally, DOE obtained regulatory approval to initiate mixed low level waste shipments to NTS. The mixed waste is to be disposed at Area 5 for a limited period of time with a limited capacity via the site RCRA permit closure period that ends in 2010.

Treatment, Disposal and Transportation Highlights by Site

Ashtabula is the first Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) procurement awarded for site cleanup. There are challenges and lessons learned. The schedule slipped due to rain and transportation modes and planning of the work provided lessons learned. Solid Waste Management Unit has far less waste removed as indicated in Request for Proposal.

Physical completion for the Fernald Closure Project is expected in October/November 2006. The Project will be completed ahead of schedule. The onsite CERCLA disposal facility has been expanded. Regulators agreed to the disposal of the additional volumes of waste generated from hot spots and generator facilities. The scheduled project close out is October 2006. Other cells are being capped.

SILOS 1&2 disposal at Fernald has challenges. The waste is in temporary storage on a licensed pad at Waste Control Specialists, Texas. DOE will need to approach Texas regulators for extension in milestones and think about a second alternative strategy. Under the NTS certified program, Fernald has completed contractual responsibilities which means DOE needs to perform continuous surveillance and management of this waste stream until it gets to final disposal. WCS needs until November to respond to questions from Texas regulators regarding the license. May/June is CERCLA ROD milestone for the draft license to have waste disposed.

The physical completion of the closure contract scope at Mound was completed in July 2006. Additional work at operable unit one is required as there are concerns about VOC leaking into local sanitary landfill.

The West Valley Demonstration Project acquisition is underway for interim end state work scope until 2012 to determine who has responsibility for D&D projects. Shipments have been suspended as a result of an incident in which absorbent material that was found on the bed of a truck. DOE must assure corrective actions are not required before shipments can continue from West Valley to Nevada.

TSCA will continue to operate for another 2-3 years. DOE is working on how to incentivize contractors to perform work. They are also dealing with how to get generator sites more accountable for having waste delivered on time to match waste streams with various metal contaminants so that waste can be treated optimally within emission limits for the facility.

Although physical completion at Rocky Flats has been declared, there are still orphaned waste streams to be treated and disposed. Final wastes to be treated through middle FY07.

Portsmouth Special Nuclear Material Waste will be sent to a commercial facility and treated at East Tennessee Technology Park.

The two DOV 6 conversion projects at Portsmouth and Paducah deal with depleted uranium hex chloride. A supplemental analysis is being worked to identify a disposal site for this product.

An NE project to extract thorium (U233) turned into an EM project at Oak Ridge. DOE made the decision to dispose of the waste instead of creating isotopes. EM is struggling with the process that has been designed. The performance baseline should be approved soon.

DOE has been working with NMED on waste disposal for remote handled waste at WIPP. The final approval of the permit modification has been extended. DOE is looking for the extension decision by the New Mexico Environment Department secretary to be made in November. Sites are being readied for accepting waste, i.e., start up plans and ramping up. The steady state of shipments will be 6 per week. TRUPACS are critical to disposition of waste at Savannah in the future.

Regarding shipping goals, 30 shipments per week are expected for contact handled waste. Idaho's goal is to complete by 2012. Operational issues at LANL have stalled shipments. Savannah River continues to ship regularly and milestones have been met. Hanford's schedule will go beyond 2012. The baseline plan is being revisited.

NTS issued a request for task proposal for IDIQ for IDIQ vendors to characterize and repackage large waste and make road ready to meet requirements for TRAMPAC. The new contract for TRU waste couriers will begin. The transition from the old contract to the new is in progress.

Greater than Class C waste presents challenges. The question is: is geologic performance required or with additional performance can near surface burials or boreholes be used as an option. In addition, it appears that 2200 cm of waste will not be generated for another 20 years which argues against a stand alone facility. DOE is looking at using existing facilities to be cost effective.

EM is working with other organizations to identify treatment and disposal methods for High Level Waste and is reviewing project plans for revisiting disposition plans. Idaho has chosen the option to directly dispose rather than use vitrification of waste streams. Tanks for liquid waste have been designed and construction is to begin within the next year. Completion is scheduled for 2008 and the treatment of waste is to begin in 2009 per the Idaho settlement agreement. Hanford will be disposing of Cesium and strontium the repository rather than incorporating the waste into the waste treatment project being designed for the tanks.

Plutonium disposition project has been approved by the Undersecretary and initiated.

Ms. Shelley Cimon – Hanford CAB: Does this also include Hanford that announced at a TPA milestone meeting that direction from HQ to plan for movement of the material to Savannah River in the spring that a letter would go to Congress this fall to address the EIS.

Ms. Gelles stated there may be supplemental NEPA analysis related to the consolidation of Plutonium still at Hanford, LANL and Livermore. Ms. Gelles will take the question to HQ for response. Ms. Gelles is not aware that consolidation will be implemented immediately. This capability is designed to accommodate that material if DOE can get over hurdles.

The Enriched Uranium Disposition Project at Savannah River will evaluate the use of spent fuel. High Level Waste vitrification efforts continue. There are challenges at the waste treatment facility. There will be a higher canister production rate due to new information on the amount of sludge in the tanks.

General Issues

Disposition maps, data and other documents can be found on DOE's website. The National LLW Disposition Strategy is ready for distribution. CABs will receive a copy during the meeting. The development of complex wide integration planning that will include an integrated baseline is still going. The NRC is rethinking about the reclassification of depleted uranium waste classification. Now that there is a large quantity of depleted uranium that exists, should this material be managed as a Class A waste. If there is a new waste class, it precludes disposal of converted product at Portsmouth and Paducah at Envirocare in Utah and would necessitate the use of a DOE facility such as NTS.

Question and Answer Period

Mr. Campbell - NNM CAB: On life cycle cost analysis for disposal decisions, is there a desire to implement the policy of EM? The interest is because of the Area G Record of Decision (ROD) from 1999 that approves of waste being buried in the ground in unlined pits. The public is concerned. The new LANL operations contractor is examining this. EM life cycle cost analysis requirements have not been implemented and there are no plans for NNSA to implement plans.

Ms. Gelles indicated that DOE is proceeding with analysis of existing processes and approvals in place and to what degree cost benefit analysis is complete on a number of projects – one being Area G. Implementation will be difficult because it is an EM analysis at an NNSA site/program and a new contract for operations at the site has already been issued. The guidance needs to be updated and a more rigorous process by which to evaluate the documentation in place under current circumstances must occur. Commercial exemptions are inconsistent among the sites and it is the process that triggers the cost benefit analysis being reviewed. This process needs to be taken in steps. DOE can not change policies at one time. A project plan is laid out for moving through analytical steps and making recommendations for policy changes, i.e., DOE Order 435.1 and trying to build in requirements for future decisions. Ms. Gelles provided examples of cost benefit analysis at Oak Ridge (for build out/expansion for their onsite disposal facility) and Paducah and Portsmouth facilities.

Mr. Campbell - NNM CAB: Indicates that the public is concerned with Area G facility at LANL being full and the expansion of the Area. Can HQ help with focusing efforts and work with LASO/LANL and the public to seeing how to move forward?

Ms. Gelles stated that the ability to do defensible cost benefit analysis depends on having a documented and a well defined baseline. The baseline must be subject to external independent review, must show cost effectiveness and a decision that is in the best interest of the government.

Mr. Campbell - NNM CAB: Is concerned that work will begin soon to expand Area G.

Ms. Gelles stated that decisions must be carefully coordinated with NNSA as EM does not have a direct line of authority over LANL contractors.

Ms. Rhonda Smith – PGDPCAB: Do you have anything specific about Paducah and cost benefit analysis? Does anything change with the DOV 6 conversion project or are you just doing a financial review and finding that since the dynamics are new and changing, you'll just do reviews periodically.

Ms. Gelles stated that there is no change to the current plan for Paducah.

Mr. Norm Mulvenon – ORSSAB: How does one access the website?

Ms. Gelles instructed Mr. Mulvenon to go to the website, where he will need a password and user id to gain access. She suggested that participants call Doug Tonkay at (301) 903-7212 for assistance.

Ms. Karen Patterson – SRS CAB: Regarding two way shipping assumptions for Savannah River. HQ is pushing for more than 4 shipments per week?

Ms. Gelles stated that a steady state of 4 is the goal, however, 5-6 shipments per week have been performed. The steady state of 4 shipments per week is a baseline assumption. Compliance drivers influence the allocation of resources, although acceleration of the schedule is encouraged.

Mr. Donald Jordan – NNM CAB: Cost benefit analysis as it applies to criteria, does the analysis include national security as it affects Area G? As an example, is there consideration for protecting and securing exposed areas, like area G?

Ms. Gelles stated National Security is the premise of the Quick to WIPP program to deploy a suite of facilities to allow DOE to remove and transport material on an accelerated basis. The current situation has HQ concerned. To remedy the situation, HQ is: conducting weekly conference calls to recover schedule; the new contractor has developed an integrated authorization basis strategy; and site office responsibilities have changed to assure more accountability.

Update on Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling Technology, Mr. Larry Bailey, Director, Office of Groundwater & Soil Remediation

Mr. Bailey provided a report regarding the establishment of the new Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation. The primary purposes of the new organization are to integrate, transfer, and implement new and/or proven technologies throughout the complex, to openly communicate with the public, elected officials, and other stakeholders, to significantly reduce risk and uncertainty, and to ensure the best science, engineering, and public health information is thoroughly discussed with all stakeholders to ensure all parties understand the site groundwater and soil challenges in meeting the state and federal cleanup standards and future land uses. He summarized the vision and strategic plan and targeted the following key focus areas:

- Acquisitions: Ensure sites/contracts contain technical performance measures to assure technologies and systems are operating efficiently and effectively to meet clean up standards.
- Independent reviews: Optimization teams composed of public and private business/organizations will conduct independent assessments that focus principally on installed remediation systems, surface and groundwater monitoring systems, soil and groundwater models, and the effectiveness of existing monitored natural attenuation programs.

Mr. Bailey discussed program challenges and uncertainties.

- Subsurface contaminants: Mr. Bailey's organization is working with DOE's Office of Science on subsurface contaminants such as Technetium-99, Strontium-90, Chromium and Uranium. Information gathered and technologies determined to be used will be shared and transitioned with the EM and other Departmental sites.
- Meeting regulatory cleanup standards: A complex-wide initiative will be undertaken to determine if the site timetables for meeting the standards is accurate.
- Regulatory challenges: EM sites need to consider presumptive risk oriented remedies. For example, if the existing cleanup remedy is efficient but will not allow the site to meet and sustain meeting the agreed upon cleanup standards, then the EM sites identify the need for other technologies and discuss

this approach with the stakeholders. In these instances, EM does not need to wait for the regulators to tell us that the in-place technology will not meet the standards.

- Site characterization: There is more site characterization to do. The Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation staff will be visiting sites to be updated on what the site has done to reduce or eliminate the sources, bring in independent resources to look at different technologies that are available and can make a substantive difference in reducing risks, uncertainties, and cleanup investments.
- Technology: The Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation will also be evaluating the impact and value of existing technologies in conjunction with the technology needs identified by the D&D and Waste Processing offices. The assessment of existing technologies is needed to assure that for the future, other organizations, such as Legacy Management, will have the technology assessment for making forward looking decisions.
- Sampling: The Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation is working with Office of Science to align EM's technology needs with the basic research program. Mr. Bailey highlighted a few examples of testing modes occurring at a few sites, i.e., monitored natural attenuation and enhanced attenuation areas. Labs are working on DNA analysis for field measurement capability where a sample can be taken and measured to determine microbial activities.

Mr. Bailey responded to a question asked on the previous day's tour. The question was in regards to future technology needs. Mr. Bailey stated that a request to field offices to compile a ten year (FY 2007-2017) listing of remediation technology needs for the sites would be made within the next couple of weeks. The request would include the areas of waste processing, deconstruction & decontamination and groundwater and soil. This is an opportunity for CABs to provide input.

Question and Answer Period

Mr. Campbell - NNM CAB: Regarding technology over time. We cannot rely on older methods/technology. It is important for the contractors to understand this. Mr. Campbell encouraged Mr. Bailey's organization to work with the CABs to take information to the public in order to increase the public's confidence in DOE's ability to monitor and detect constituents at the sites. The program that you described is a big change for DOE and contractors. How far along are you in the implementation of the program and how do you keep it from being another fad that disappears before it has a chance to be effective?

Mr. Bailey stated they are targeting the EM acquisition process. They are focusing on identifying new technical performance measures and including them in new acquisitions. Once in the contract, these new measures become a formal requirement. Mr. Bailey's office is also networking with the private sector and as a result of their contacts, they are educating regulators and other stakeholders as well. He stated that EM HQ will be targeting the more meaningful application of technologies rather than continuing to perform research on technologies that need to be taken to the field for testing. He also mentioned that the public needs to understand that state and federal cleanup standards are subject to change and this is partially based upon a laboratory's ability to analyze samples at very low levels. With samples now being measured in parts per billion, the public needs to understand the basis for the cleanup standards and how the standards are associated with public health studies.

Ms. Cimon - HAB: Ms. Cimon is excited about the direction of DOE. However, there is a piece that is missing that is programmatic and systematic throughout all our sites, that is the lack of public participation in decisions. Ms. Cimon suggested the use of site technology coordination groups at sites and HQ to engage in a dynamic forum to see what's out there in technology and the ability to use technologies across the sites.

Mr. Bailey thanked Ms. Cimon for her suggestion.

Mr. Mulvenon - ORSSAB: Mr. Mulvenon agreed with Ms. Cimon regarding the use of site technology coordination groups. He also stated that it sounds like there is more participation from HQ. There should be a partnership between sites, federal employees, contractors, the public, and CABs to assure public and DOE requirements are satisfied. Regarding measurements, DOE should assure when talking with the public that the standards reflect the measurements.

Mr. Bailey thanked Mr. Mulvenon for his suggestion.

Round Robin: Groundwater Issues at Each Site

Chairs from the EM Advisory Boards across the DOE Complex provided their sites' top groundwater issues and concerns to the group. Mr. Bailey briefly responded to several site groundwater issues of concern. He referenced cross-site groundwater issues and suggested that the Office of Groundwater and Soil remediation investigate using natural attenuation and enhanced attenuation at more sites. He stated that Pump and Treat alternatives should be an alternative and not the only option. Mr. Bailey indicated that his office plans to make use of more independent technical teams to perform independent reviews on soil and groundwater contamination issues. He also stated the intent of his office is to encourage and solicit more public participation in the remediation decision-making process. He reminded the group that interim RODs are not final and may be modified based upon the need for a new technology. Additionally, he pointed out that each interim and final ROD is site dependent (Groundwater Issues attached).

Public Comment Period

Mr. Richard Deertrack (NNMCAB), Ms. Linda Long (PGDP CAB) and Mr. Christopher Timm (NNMCAB) provided public comment. Mr. Deertrack referenced a worldwide water conference he attended in Japan. He raised the issue of privatizing fresh water rights. He then asked if citizens have a right to fresh drinking water. Mr. Bailey responded by stating that EM was concerned with the issue of water rights. Ms. Long considered the groundwater discussion to be sound and relevant. Considering Paducah's concern with their groundwater, she felt the discussion to be relevant and appreciated the EM Board examining this issue on a complex wide basis. Mr. Timm asked EM to look closely at groundwater issues from a complex wide perspective.

Discussion with Mr. James Rispoli, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management

Mr. Rispoli stated that this EM Board was the largest Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) compliant Board in the country, which draws much attention to the local boards. He stated that site tours are an effective way to see the challenges across the complex. Mr. Rispoli reviewed each of the sites top issues. He stated his concern that some site managers are not responding to the recommendations/advice of the Boards. Mr. Rispoli reaffirmed his commitment to the mission of the EM SSAB and will continue to reiterate its importance to site managers.

Mr. Rispoli stated his top priorities:

1. Safety
2. Risk Reduction
3. Project Management expertise
4. Improved organizational alignment
5. Providing opportunities for increased feedback & lessons learned

Mr. Rispoli announced the new SSAB Charter has been finalized and interim guidance has been released. He asked the CABs for their comments on this guidance. Site wide, there are three allegations of non-compliance that are being investigated. He described the DOE's five-year plan, which is designed to focus on priority challenges. Mr. Rispoli stated that public input will be a valuable tool for strategizing priorities. Mr. Rispoli has requested assistance from the National Academy of Public Administration on several areas including organizational alignment and project management. The focus for EM senior management will be on project execution and goal completion. Project management will be performance based reviews. He stated that the EM SSAB could provide input on project risk decision-making. He further explained that his goal was to remain 90% on budget target for project performance. He referenced the success of Rocky Flats and Fernald as examples for the remainder of EM sites to use in meeting challenges.

Question and Answer Period

Ms. Patterson – SRS CAB: SRS finds that early access to information regarding plans and projects to be helpful with regards to the CAB's ability to provide effective and timely input. It appears early access is eroding.

Mr. Rispoli indicated he will be holding his second leadership meeting. Public involvement is high on his agenda to discuss. He will also emphasize how important it is to utilize the EM SSAB and involve them in the public participation process.

Ms. Patterson – SRS CAB: Co-mingling of EM and NNSA generated waste has caused difficulty with the various public comment opportunities.

Mr. Rispoli indicated there is a vehicle in place for EM to invite NNSA site managers to become involved in the public participation process.

Mr. Campbell - NNM CAB: Will the EM SSAB's mission be expanded to include more current operations at sites based on EM's apparent expanded role to cleanup environmental issues when portions of the facilities are closed?

Mr. Rispoli explained by expanding the EM SSAB's mission to include NNSA covered areas would be complex due to the diverse mission of NNSA. Mr. Rispoli did confirm that EM's role is expanding from legacy waste and that time would tell if the EM SSAB's responsibilities would also expand. Mr. Rispoli did indicate that individual site managers, such as Ed Wilmot, might accept the CAB's comments on environmental matters related to current operations. EM cannot look at other program issues since EM may not be the responsible official to respond to the advice.

Mr. Campbell - NNM CAB: Budget is a concern to EM SSAB. We would like an update on the budget and how priorities are set.

Mr. Rispoli discussed relative risk ranking and how it is used to set budget priorities. Mr. Rispoli also indicated that the funding profile is inadequate due to unrecognized liabilities. He will be going before Congress to justify an increase of at least \$25 million since this amount is not currently included in the funding profile. He described the complex mosaic of communities, environmental law, state regulators, waste generation and management and how this all plays into the concept of relative risk management and budget prioritizing strategies. He concluded that determining the priorities for relative risk management is an opportunity for EM SSAB to be involved in the decision making process that includes understanding prioritization of work and considering trade offs and regulatory commitments. The continuing resolution is expected to continue through the elections.

Ms. Smith - PGDPCAB: PGDPCAB would like to see more discussion to clarify the definition and scope of the EM purview and specifically how that relates to the spent nuclear fuel project at Paducah.

Mr. Rispoli explained that if a site is given a new mission, the program would determine the public participation process. Mr. Rispoli referred workshop attendees to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) public involvement process as another way to become involved in the public comment process.

Mr. William Flanery – INL CAB: Yucca Mountain will eventually meet capacity. What are DOE's future plans for High-Level Waste disposition?

Mr. Rispoli stated this particular issue is not under EM purview. However, there is a way to deal with spent nuclear fuel through a fuel recycling program. Mr. Rispoli referenced England's fuel recycling program as a possible option.

Presentation by Mr. Edwin Wilmot, Manager, Los Alamos Site Office (LASO)

Mr. Wilmot discussed his top EM Priorities for the Los Alamos site. Mr. Wilmot's priorities and major areas of concern for Los Alamos are:

- Groundwater issues
- Waste operational issues
- Waste treatment facilities
- Waste storage and transportation

Mr. Wilmot described his major challenges over the past few years:

- Seven month LANL shutdown resulted in untimely responses to NNM CAB recommendations.
- Managing operational issues
- Managing new contract
- Outdated/inaccurate/unimproved baseline to measure performance
- Collaborating with NMED on the LANL Consent Order

Mr. Wilmot introduced Mr. George Rael, as the new permanent Assistant Manager for Environmental Programs at LASO. Mr. Rael's top priorities for the NNM CAB are:

- Providing public participation opportunities
- Increasing public outreach efforts.

Question and Answer Period

Mr. Campbell - NNM CAB: Will LASO entertain questions and recommendations from the NNM CAB regarding current operations at LANL?

Mr. Wilmot responded that LASO would welcome questions and recommendations from the NNM CAB regarding current operations at LANL.

Environmental Stewardship Commitment at LANL, Mr. John Mitchell, Deputy Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory

Mr. Mitchell discussed environmental stewardship commitment at LANL and provided a brief background on the new LANL contract. He described the geographical challenges of the site but stated the tools of effective management for dealing with these challenges would remain the same. The new

management team brings experience and enthusiasm and stated his commitment to working with the regulators to develop trust and credibility. Mr. Mitchell outlined LASO/LANL environmental cleanup goals as follows:

- Focus on remedial clean-up work
- Invest in an accelerated clean-up plan
- Instituting plans that focus on the waste generation reduction
- Continuing goal of zero discharge as the responsible course of action

Round Robin: Top Three Site Issues

Chairs from the EM Advisory Boards across the DOE Complex briefly described the top three issues that are considered most important to their sites. (Site Issues attached)

SSAB Chair's Product to DOE

The SSAB Chairs developed a draft letter to DOE regarding public participation in technology development and deployment at DOE sites. The group agreed to finalize the letter and present it at Friday's work session.

Friday, September 8, 2006

Opening, Mr. Doug Frost, Deputy Federal Officer (DFO) and Ms. Melissa Nielson, Director, Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability

Mr. Frost provided opening comments. He announced that Ms. Linda Long, PGDP CAB, was being honored for her work with the Paducah Advisory Board. She announced her retirement with the PGDP CAB and spoke of her hopes for the Board's continuing success. Mr. Frost presented her with a plaque for distinguished service to the EM SSABs.

SSAB Chair's Product to DOE

The SSAB Chairs agreed to the final contents of the letter. The letter will be formatted by NNM CAB staff and distributed to the SSAB's for consideration/approval. Upon approval, each chair will send its signature to the NNM CAB for inclusion in the final letter to DOE.

Spring 2007 SSAB Chairs Meeting

Ms. Peterson announced the next semi-annual Chairs meeting would be held in Las Vegas, Nevada in the spring of 2007. The meeting will have a public participation theme. The Chairs also plan to include a section in the meeting to 'share successes.' Ms. Peterson made a motion to include a workshop on the FACA requirements and responsibilities at the next Chairs meeting. She suggested the proposed workshop would help the Board to understand the precepts and tenants of the act. Ms. Donna Antonucci, SRS CAB, seconded the motion. As all were in favor, a workshop, 'FACA 101,' would be included in the spring 2007 SSAB Chair's agenda.

The following individuals volunteered to be on the Steering Committee for the Spring EM SSAB Semi-annual Chairs meeting: Mr. J.D. Campbell, Ms. Shelly Cimon, and Mr. Norman Mulvenon.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Richard Deertrack provided public comment. He thanked the EM SSAB for their participation and stated his sincere appreciation for their willingness and ability to involve the public in important decisions that affect families and communities. He also thanked the staff of the NNM CAB for organizing a successful meeting and he noted all the hard work that is involved in planning this semi-annual meeting.

Meeting Wrap-up and Closing Remarks

Ms. Cimon thanked Ms. Menice Santistevan and her staff. She really enjoyed staying at La Fonda in Santa Fe and that the hotel provided the group with a beautiful and very scenic meeting place. She also thanked Ms. Lorrie Bonds-Lopez, LANL, for planning the LANL site tour. Mr. Frost also thanked the NNM CAB for a 'seamless' meeting. Mr. Jordan thanked the SRS CAB for providing the travel and services of Mr. Mike Schoener for facilitating the meeting, and thanked Mr. Schoener for the excellent job.

Adjournment

Mr. Frost, DFO, adjourned the meeting at 11:45a.m.

Attachments

- ❖ Update on Waste Disposition, Mr. Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory Compliance, Prepared for the SSAB Chairs Meeting, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Presented by Ms. Christine Gelles
- ❖ DOE National Low Level Waste/Mixed Low Level Waste Disposition Strategy, Ms. Christine Gelles, Director of Disposal Operations
- ❖ Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation Update, Mr. Lawrence Bailey, Director, Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation
- ❖ EM Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting Groundwater Issues Submitted by Each Site
- ❖ EM Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting Top Three Issues of Concern Submitted by Each Site